Notes on "He Slew the Dreamer"

Bud: I am making these for my own purposes and making a few marginal notes as I read the book. Some of them may be of possible future interest to you. Bear in mind that I am making these as I get, that there will be interruptions in the reading and note-making, and that later what seems accurate on reading may turn out not to be or to be dubious. As of now I've read but the first chapter and the highly-prejudicial appendix, which was the first thing I read. It is an exceptional and dishonest thing to do, to collect all this racist spew and add it to an alleged reporting job. It is unrelated to anything but the intent to create prejudice. Instead, were this a serious work of non-fiction, that space could well have been used for an index.

It strikes me as exceptional there is no foreword to the book. I take it not that Huie and the Dell people didn't want one. As King had written the foreword for Three Lives, adding to its sales appeal, the foreword of any prominent person, perhaps a prominent black leader, would have broadened the sales potential. I have a hunch there is no such foreword, not a single bit of blurbing from anyone else, simply because it was not possible to interest those who might have served such purposes, which could be a reflection of prevailing attitudes toward Huie and his writing, here and in LOOK

Interesting is the restriction in the copyright. It precludes any radio or TV review or other use, a clear bid to hold out for the possibility of paid-for TV treatment. Because of the controversial nature of the book and more, its author and the role in which he cast himself, I doubt this is an enforceable reservation.

The origin of the title of the book is given on the page opposite the copyright page. It is something less than forthright, ignoring the original and contracted title, which was "They Slew the Dreamer". The original title, not the second one, is consistent with the cited scriptural source, Genesis 37 :19-20. So, rather than from Genesis, "He Slew the Dreamer" is derived from "They Slew the Dreamer".

In the opening paragraph, Huie's statement that he alone, by money, could get info from Ray, when he shows no concern for his intrustion into the proper working of the legal of defense, there are also several statements he had to know are not true:

"I decided to try to persuade him to sell me information". This is later repeated in similar formulations, as on 3. Huie knows full well that he paid Ray nothing, knowing that the contracts provide Ray would get nothing. He bought nothing from Ray. Rather he bribed Ray with the misapprehension Ray would have to have the money he could provide to pay lawyers, which was false.

"That he would ever give information at any trial seemed unlikely". Huie knew and, according to Jerry, who is supported by logic, that Ray wanted to testify at the trial. This would have ruined Huie's investment.

"And no suspect or defendant in the United States can be compelled to give information." This is false. He can be, under an immunity grant. Here Huie deceitively seems to be quoting the Fifth Amendment, but he is not. He is, again and knowingly, lying.

2/ The description in the quoted letter of what Huie says he will pay a price for is not a confession, not an account of the crime, not what supports the cover blurbing.

For him to say "You might help yourself by helping me to help others understand you" is, on the one hand, from this book and the book writing, entirely false and a designed deception. If it had serious intent, that intent had to be to interfere with the functioning of the judicial system and the influencing of potential jurors.

This offer does not give Ray's story entirely away, as the reality did.

Huie's promise is, "I will pay you a substantial sum". Ray, to his knowledge, never got a cent, and Huie's paying it to Hanes is not the same as "I will pay you a substantial sum".

3. The statement that he personally paid Ray $10,000 is false, and he knew it, for he had the contracts and he knew Ray got and was to get nothing. Moreover, the assignment to Hanes is not as stated here. That assignment was prior to the signing of any agreement with Huie, so it is trickery to imply Ray ever had this money or, at the time it was passed, even had the power to influence what would happen with it. The contracts provided for no payment until a month after ~~zzzzzzzzzzz~~ Ray's return to the U.S. and after Huie first saw him. Thus it was not, as he says, a calculated risk for him, because prior to any of this he had a deal at least with Dell, and it is from the Dell advance Hanes to have provided funds. Aside from this, there was the LOOK income.

"I could accept as truth only what I could verify". If this is so, why he wrote for LOOK what he had every reason to assume was other than truth, for he did not and could not verify it. Yet he wrote it and planned the original book in terms of a conspiracy. Also, the Raoul bit.

"Nevertheless, I decided to pay my money and make the effort". Technically, after Dell paid it, it was Huie's money, but the question is, would he have gotten it without the Ray contract? Did not Huie sell the expected from Ray, returning a fraction of this not to Ray but to the lawyers?

4. The reference to his meeting with Judge Battle is considerably foreshortened to make it congenial to his concept of self. It was not this spontaneous but was arranged for him by a reporter. How is this consistent with Battle's account of it in court.

The self-quotation at the bottom of the page and most of the next is prejudicial padding. It is also irrelevant. What some may have thought of Eddie Slavin, whether or not warranted or accurate, is unrelated to Ray. This is a device to build prejudice against Ray in the guise of sympathetic treatment.

7. The end of the second paragraph is at such sharp variance with the standard Huie technique of detailed specification even when it is neither necessary nor useful, an over-abundance of unnecessary detail to make it seem his writing is just overflowing with detailed, relevant fact, I quote it:

"...and here is what is remembered about these years."

The rest of the page is taken up with an entirely unattributed account of what an entirely unidentified person or persons may have recalled, may have been quoted from another, unidentified source, etc. It is directly quoted, therefore, assuming Huie didn't make it up, he had a source. It is neither given nor suggested. One wonders if it could have been a source like the FBI. But it is very exceptional for Huie to avoid citation of his source, by name. This is in the sharpest contrast with what immediately follows, on p. 8, where even the number of Ray's Army discharge is given. This is pointless specification, yo'al-bait, but typical Huie.

15. The citation of the superintendent of the Fulton Hospital is the citation of the only source who would say what Huie wanted. It is barrel-scrapping, for that is not the doctor who had had Ray, not a psychiatrist-and Huie knew and could have quoted the competent source, the shrink. And it is in contrast with all the statement of those who did know Ray, as this doctor didn't. He could, at best, but read the brief records made by others. There is no reason to believe his opinion is as competent as that of any of the others. See DOUB on this point. And it is rubbish to say that Ray's record "indicates he may be willing to kill for gain", on the spurious ground that "there is very little difference between armed robbery and plain old killing for money". But is this what Huie, in this book, says Ray did-kill for money?

Having quoted the non-expert as the expert, not having quoted the real experts known to him, who all hold contrary opinions. Huie concludes with a vert tricky formulation that his "record" shows Ray to be "an anti-social man capable of murder". This is false. The closest to truth this can be would be the statement that an uniformed reading of the records, ignoring all these who had the records for the reading, is this interpretation. It is no more than an interpretation and, say what one will of Ray, during armed robberies he never fired a shot.

14. Based upon the "understanding" he thus got of Ray, "I was ready to confront the obvious questions". These all have Ray as the murderer. Huie manages to avoid the obvious, an by raised of Ray in the roles of decoy or patsy rather than killer.

15. It seems suspicious that there in each of the other cases, like KKK, mafia, Huie denies their involvement. When he gets to the wealthy extremists who consider themselves patriots, he merely ask the question of their doing the job and leaves the question unanswered.

16. The chapter concludes with the lie with which it opened:

"So the task I had undertaken was to try to buy from Ray expressions which could lead to the answers".

He bought nothing from Ray for Ray never got any money from him. Ray's lawyers got it all, xxxxxxx

Huie's repetition of this lie is almost psychopathic. Yet he clearly is unwilling to say that he got information from Ray in return for paying Ray's lawyers, which is closer to reality, or that he stood by and did nothing when, to his knowledge, Ray's lawyers robbed Ray.

This first chapter is deceptive, not by accident; misrepresentative, again, not by accident; lies when it isn't necessary; and is openly prejudicial. With this for openers, what can one expect of the rest of the book?

Chapter 2

The cheap but popular high-school journalism approach that has become so commercial but is less than professional, reflecting also a deep contempt for both the craft and the audience, is the manner of beginning the second chapter.

Having gone to some extented trouble to make it clear that he bought exclusivity from Ray, and as though it were of some consequence in the account of either King's assassination or Ray's part in it, Huie wrotes "James Earl Ray described <u>for me</u> his escape from prison on April 23.1967. Using a ball-point pen and ruler, yellow, legal-sized paper, he wrote:" etc. What the hell was he to use, an electric typewriter, a personal secretary, or perhaps a dictating machines, deep in the top-security part of that jail?

It is this intensity in the unessential, this concern for the trivia that is unrelated but seemingly impressive in his writing that got Huie to swallow Ray's nonsensse to begin with.

19-Huie is sensitive about having been conned by an inept con shows early, in his childish justification of his publishing the nonsense he got from Ray in Look. He cannot say he was regularly conned, nor, after this big slef-buildup, can he admit to having gotten nothing but irrelevant trivia from Ray. So he says he published an account of Ray's escape, complete with Ray's diagram, in Look, so Ray would know "that I was willing to help him protect his accomplices if he would help me establish the truth about the murder". Did it work? It did not. And what about taking money from Look for this, what about those millions of misinformed readers? What about a writers responsibilities and his ethics and morality? If these considerations troubled the exponent and practitioner of dollar journalism, that concern does not show. There is no indication of regret, no apology, no refund. And no reason to believe the excuse. It is Huie's pretense that Huie the great was not fuped by Ray the con. Even the manner of resuming the narrative after giving what he says is the correct account of Ray's escape is so indefinite, one wonders what else is secretly galling this great ego:"Ray's written account of his escape after he jumped out of the truck is not challenged by prison authorities and seems to be true";Thus Huie may be suggesting that Ray later corrected his first and false account, which may not be what Huie intended. In any event, from here on if there is anything wrong in the adcount of the escape, it is the fault of prison authorities, in the reader's mind. Again, none of this relates in any way to the professed purpose of the book or the former journalism. the get the story of the King murder and the "true story" of Ray.

At this point there begins what must be a length quote from the uncredited and discredited LOOK writing, followed by paraphrases of it. To this point, save for the above-quoted excuse, one would not know that Huie had written three major (and well-paid) articles for Look on this same material. However, the copyrights, giving the date, but no publication, do acknowledge Huie is using his LOOK disgrace.

21. The first interpolation is the continuing Huie defense of the fooled Huie. It is much more difficult for Huie to live with his having been fooled by an inept cheap crook that the average reader can known. And he read that very brave Huie account of Huie as the superior of the entire FBI with his dollar-journalism approach, the reader is put better understand now, after nothing but a quotation from what was bad journalism when it appeared in Look: "Note this further evidence that Ray is no longer inept but has become crafty". This is a skill he apparently developed in prison from doing nothing there. It is also the kind of writing required by the also-very-bad Blair book, which emphasis that Ray was only inept, and Huie is dominated with the Huie-felt need to defend the Huie rep.

Huie the omniscient also defends the government, creating a straw man, quoted without identification, for the purpose (21). After mentioned an error in publishing Ray's prints when he escaped jail, then saying that was "later" corrected, but not saying when "later" was, as though it were almost immediately, he writes this "is being exploited by the assassination myth-makers". Apparently the man responsible for most of the erroneous writing on the King assassination is not, in his own eyes, a mythmaker. He here launches into what is presented as the prevailing belief of this undescribed and unidentified "mythmakers with quotes that have to be made up of or the insignificant irresponsible fringe, the allegation that the CIA and/or FBI got Ray out of jail just to use him as a decoy, etc. This is rubbish and it did not come from anyone known as a responsible critic as any aspect of government behavior or reporting on any of the assassinations. Huie's self-defense requires of him further dishonesty, of which this is a first sample of defense against criticism of his own terrible work.

And at this point in his writing, having recovered his self-respect, Huie allows the novelist to take command, with a personalized, detailed account of the only-irrelevant, how he travelled in Chicago, [rented car], how he found the various people (all spelled out for him by Ray, making it his accomplishment past the ability xxxx of a child old enough to read, and all the endless irrelevancies about the unessential people, like the restaurant-owning Struves-Klingmann's, his being Dutch, their being hard-working and successful in a wealthy Chicago suburb, having a son who is a PhD,, climaxing with a further build-up of both Huie, was was conned, and Ray, who did the conning, with an account of how welcome and capable (as a dish-washer, steam-table man!) Ray was, etc. Of course, no one else (read not even the FBI) had been there asking about Rayns (Ray).

25-Continuing with this long irrelevancy straight from LOOK, Ray at the restaurant where he was liked, Huie begins what seems likely to be the acknowledgement of minor error only in his Look writing, but not admitted as either error or in his published writing. He says merely that his "early misconception" was that Ray "doesn't 'like girls'". In his account there is indication this was relatively early writing in the book, for in tracing Ray's relationship with women, he includes Canada (one case only, not specified) and Mexico (ditto), but no reference to Portugal, where his relations with a woman were well reported-but later.

Almost all of this chapter is devoted to Ray at the Indian Trail restaurant. It begins with his jail escape and the last page is on his leaving Winnetka and how he got to Canada. But because it is about 8% of the text of the book, it offers an evaluation of whether this book is really on the assassination of King and Ray's part in it. Here also are the typical Huie belittling of xxxxx the FBI, whose investigation was inferior to his: nobody had called on the restaurant people to ask of Ray, as though Huie would have if Ray hadn't wanted him to and told him about it only because he wanted him to; Ray's low opinion of the FBI ("...I over-estimated them. When they run out of informers they lose their imagination"). There are more cracks about those allegedly believing the CIA and FBI "decided to kill xxxx Dr. King and arranged Ray's escape in order to use him" (23), etc. There is not a single thing here to show that Huie did anything Ray did not direct him to except waste time:check the papers for the time Ray was there to see if there was any reporting that might explain Ray desire to do the killing.

But where there is a viable investigative lead (27), it is ignored. When Ray left the restaurant he gave it a post-office box number to which to mail his last check. Now he may or may not have left a forwarding address at the post office when he abandoned that box. But Huie does not report asking. For $1.00 the post office provides the forwarding address. The one chance to investigate he reports this great investigative reporter ignored.

The this point in these notes I've gotten to p. 39, roughly 15% of the book. To this point is it a literary garbage heap, an uncredited reprinting, infrequent rewriting, of what was bad when it appeared in Look. Nothing more than an infrequent self-justification is added, and these do not improve its worth of quality. But perhaps the biggest piece of trash is the fiction Huie either had to know was fiction or he was so incompetent he didn't even read the papers. The fact of misrepresentation seems to make this fiction in the form of a gross lie, bearing very much on whether there was a conspiracy of which Ray was part, seems to provide reason to believe this is deliberate. It is at the opening of the chapter (34), where he begins to explain how Ray took the name Galt, from a road sign, and how he added the rest, given knowingly wrongly, as only "Eric S." (~~xxxxx~~ "he looked through the Galts in the telephone directories"-35).

The earlier version is no better: that Ray went through the newspaper morgues and found men of his approximate age from the birth records, taking their names.

Huie knew Ray did not go as Eric S. Galt. He went as Eric Starvo Galt, and there is no such in any directory. Ray took the identity of one Eric St. Vincent Galt. In his signature, this real Galt writes the St. V in a way that makes it look like Starvo. In fact, the Associated Press, my sources distributed the signature of the real Eric St. Vincent Galt, to show this. So, here is Huie, making it up. Whether to defend himself or the government is immaterial. That is material is that it is false, does bear very much on whether or not there was a conspiracy, and Huie either had to have known this, which seems obvious, or didn't know his material, which excuses him no more.

This is not the only indication of proof of conspiracy in Huie's possession avoided or misrepresented here and in LOOK. For example, on 40, after reporting that following the purchase of less expensive clothing three days earlier, Huie "ordered a $150 tailor-made suit...", he concludes the same paragraph more with these two sentences," He later notified this company to mail this suit to him at 2808 Highland Avenue, Birmingham, Alabama. It was so mailed and received." But, four pages earlier, Huie had written of Ray's "travel from Montreal to Birmingham, a city which Ray had never visited before...." The question is obvious: how did the entirely-alone Ray, not part of any conspiracy, know the exact address in a strange city to which he would go and for what reason did he go there, none being apparent if he were not part of anything, and all of Huie's writing to this point emphasizing Ray's ernest desire to get as far away from the US as possible?

In this chapter, to the Look goo is added a little "correction". One of the more glaringly inadequate ones is the alleged rectification of Ray's wrong account of a heist with which he got the money to live and travel on. Neither account is in any way supported, bith could have been if true. Huie winds up presenting as fact, complete with his own exposition of how cleverly he had anticipated the truth and not indicated it to Ray "to demonstrate my willingness to protect him and his accomplices in lesser crimes in return for his signed agreement to tell me the complete truth about the murder of Dr. King" (It is never an assassination, only a murder).(39). The alleged truth is that Ray robber a food market, with the date either ~~xxx~~ July 17 or 18. For the i-dotting and T-crossing Huie, who does it when it shouldn't be done, merely to impress the reader with Huie and ~~xx~~ his great skill and thoroughness, what is missing here is so easy to obtain: any police report of there having been any such robbery.

At this point (39), in his account of his dealings with Ray, Huie presents the absolutely incredible. Remember, this is the man who was spending a fortune to get an exclusive story. What was he going to do with it? Nothing at all. In fact, waste it and all the money. Why? By writing to publish it until after it was a) in all the newspapers and magazines, and b) public domain, free to everyone!

Braggart and fool Huie is. Conceited beyond measure. But wasteful of money. Of this there is no sign in his own earlier commentary of his dollar journalism is exactly contrary to any such suspicion. But he says he wrote Ray (30," Only after your trial do I expect to publish the complete truth about the murder of Dr. King. This you and I have acknowledged from the beginning....And prior to your trial I will publish only your statement that you were <u>involved</u> in the murder, I won't reveal the extent of your involvement."

Strange that he did not. Perhaps it is because he got neither from Ray and was incapable of developing any fact of his own. Prior to the trial all he published was the foolishness he wrote as though he believed it, in having what is also inherent here in an interesting way, the belief he later denied was his belief, that there had been a conspiracy.

The italicizing of "involved" above is in the original. Huie wrote here not that Ray was entirely alone, the lone murderer, but that he was part of a conspiracy, being "involved", not the shooter. This is not a single accident. He repeats it on page 48, in his account of the interview with the Canadian woman with whom Ray had a brief affair, where he told her "I need clues to his personality, to why he was involved in the murder of Dr. King". But this woman already believed and was stunned by the belief that Ray was the murderer, that having been exhaustively reported in the press.

Huie is not only aware of the proofs of conspiracy; he tried to hide them. If one may wonder at the reasons, and conjecture that for some reason, the possibility of criminal charges against him for interfering with the due processes of the law being one, there is no doubt of the fact. Fascinatingly, this repeated writing in the terms of Huie's earlier concept, that Ray was part of a conspiracy, as reflected by the repeated use of the description of Ray's involvement rather than any indication of his solitary guilt, is probably a sign that this book had been written earlier, or most of it had been, only to be rewritten after it had to be retitled from "<u>They</u> Slew the Dreamer" to make it commercially acceptable and consistent with the official fiction.

There is, to this point, nothing honest in the writing. Even in the small details, like (41), Huie's promise to protect the women, expressed in guilty manner, probably a rephrasing of what he really said, but in quotes:"...don't be afraid. No one in the United States knows your name except me and his lawyers. I'll keep it that way." Well, he didn't, and this woman's identity and innocent involvement with Ray is not secret. Despite his promise that his own experience as a reporter told him had to be meaningless, for the sake of adding a little cheap sex to his writing and thus making it more commercial, Huie dragged this woman and her children into a scandal that could hurt all of them and cost her her employment. No useful, not decent literary purpose, was served by his retailing the private story of her private life in 1968, only the cheap scrimshaw of of hack writing, for money, commercial appeal, not serious literary purposes. Here he gets remarkably dishonest, first pretending that all the needless troubles that befell her were because everyone but him was a sensation-monger, uncaring about her rights. He pretends less sagacity that a young reporter who just managed to get out of journalism school with his fathers influence lavishly applied to old friends in the pose that there should have been no interest in her by the press once he brought her to light, telling her story, which is utterly immaterial, as Huie himself proclaims, as though it were a major part of the unravelling of the crime. After retailing the titillating details, all for nothing but all again in the book, he begins an attack on everyone else, from reporters to the FBI, because they failed and hurt him (46ff). His own words are, "exposing her could be cruel and unnecessary" (47). And after the lofty pretence that he was all above this sort of trashy business (telling unnamed reporters who phoned from Canada for leads, "You can go to hell. I'm sorry

I inhabit the same planet with people like you"(-47; or CBC that he would be a witness for her in a suit against them-48) he hears echoes on his own bald head (48), saying he couldn't sleep all night and "I told my wife:'I should never have written a line about that woman. And I'm sorry I ever began work on this story...'" Both are true, he should never have mentioned this woman. The thing is, however, that he knew this when he did it and did it nonetheless, knowing, inevitably, that what followed had to follow. He also knew it is the kind of cheap thing, no matter how sympathetically written, that is commercial. And nothing is more important to dollar journalism than being thoroughly commercial. So, knowing full well that it was entirely without meaning in his story and that it had to hurt this innocent woman, Auie did what he knew was wrong and, when he needs the same kind of cheap sensation for a nothing book, uses it all over again, again when it is even less essential in any kind of demonstrably muddling of the case. Auie himself is adequate authority for its purposelessness in the book (47), for he claims to have told Canadian reporters, with proper himility and modesty,"I have published all she knows"

He knew immediately this would happen, for he confesses that also, little intending or realizing it (44), for he says that when he took her to dinner the night he met her,"She struck me as being honest, decent and generous, and I began to worry about hurting her". What better reason for jazzing up his trash with trashy irrelevancies, unless it was her plea to him, also quoted, that she was "afraid for my children, and for my position, which is a responsible one."

The undiluted dishonesty of this abuse of a decent woman and her children for no purpose other than the possibility of a few extra dollars is not disguised by the false anguish. Because it serves but the same purpose in the book, unless the hoked-up sorrow is taken as schmalz by the average uninformed reader, most of whom are uncritical, unless it is used as one of the seeming apologies for the most minor of the many errors in the LOOK writing,, the reuse is even more shameful, for it hold the possibility of forcing this woman and her children to relive the suffering he had caused earlier.

On 45 he quotes her as indicating Ray had a prejudice against blacks. That may have been in the Look article, but I do not recall it there. If this is the case, it bears heavily on Auie's initial integrity and pretty clearly shows that whichever side he is on he is crooked. In the original magazine version he indicates anything but that Ray was alone or that he had motive. I think he didn't indicate racial feelings, though he could not have known Jerry, as he did, without knowing the depth of Jerryks racist beliefs.

Treatment of Raoul is scantier in the book, but the Look stuff is still repeated, nothing but Auie's apologies for Auie having been added in the first 20 . In the abbreviated version (48ff) he quotes Ray as saying he had met with Raoul before he went to Ottawa to see the women and of having gotten a proposition from him to "make two trips accross the border from Windsor to Detroit", there having been five such meetings "between August 8 and 18" and the project scheduled for 8/21/67. What is especially interesting here is what Auie omits, giving not even h the right name of the tailor (English and Scotch Woolen Company,Montreal") where he says Ray "ordered a $150 tailor-made suit" giving the date as July 21. After Ray was identified, this shop was located by the press. Its owner is Henry J. Feigan, its name English and Cottonwood, Ltd. And, with Auie's avoidance of the essential significance of the facts, Ray had, indeed, ordered the suit to be sent to a specific address in Birmingham. Now, this tends to make Ray's story more than possible, for Auie himself had pointed out Ray had never been in Birmingham. Ray did not leave Canada, according to Auie's account (48), until four weeks after the ordering of the suit, rather a month to the day. Yet he knew in advance, all alone, when he would be in a completely strange town? Here (49) Ray's account of fearing to try and use the women to rally him is credible and makes more credible

his explanation of having accepted the "Raoul" deal. Huie cites both Jones and Foreman, each of established credential in dealing with such criminals, as saying Ray's account of his border-crossings, what he did and how it worked, is exactly what their experiences says is "standard operating proceedure" (51), something I do not recall from their LOOK writing, for it is proof of Ray's not being alone, as both there said, Jones hedging only to suggest red connections.

Especially with Ray having made some kind of record in advance of each of his subsequent moves, in each case knowing in advance when he was going where and what his address would be, something Huie here ignores, but it is fact, it is beyond question that to the time of the assassination he was not unattached, not a free agent, not moving around aimlessly.

And bearing on this are Huie's insidious references to one of the prime clues, Ray's association with an unnamed someone in New Orleans. On 49, Raoul "gave Ray a New Orleans telephone number";and 50, he quotes Ray as saying,"He again repeated the telephone number where I could contact him in New Orleans." Now if Huie asked for this number, the best possible investigative lead, and the best of possible ways of checking out the story for which he was paying so much money, he neither here nor in LOOK indicates the request. If Ray refused it to him, that also is unrecorded. And if Huie, knowing Ray's dependence upon him for money, as he had himself put in earlier, made any threats about withholding the money without this, that is unworthy of mention in his definitive book. Now either Huie is an utter incompetent or he did ask for this. Either Ray gave it to him or denied it. Whichever, it should have been recorded-even a wrong number if he gave that. One wonders if Huie would have known whetgr it was right or wrong.

In all, to this point, there could not be a most eloquent self-denunciation that Huie, thinking he is great and a little noble for apologizing for the least of the great errors, bans of himself.